

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/729,183 | 12/04/2003 | Marshall Miles | P/144-327 | 2389 |
| 7: | 590 10/13/2005 | EXAMINER | | |
| OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP | | | VU, BAO Q | |
| 1180 Avenue o | f the Americas | | | |
| New York, NY 10036-8403 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| · | | | 2838 | |
| | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/729,183 | MILES, MARSHALL | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Bao Q. Vu | 2838 | |

| | Bao Q. Vu | 2838 | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date | wing replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m | fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. | | | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN | | | | | | |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beau appeal; and/or | | educing or simplifying | the issues for | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally re | jected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | • | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | |
| | 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1.0 | | ill be entered and an o | explanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> . | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10 | | fas /- | | | | |

Bao Q. Vu Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2838 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner maintains the rejection. Applicant's narrow interpretation of the word "regulation" is noted, however it does change the facts that the most basic definition of regulation must be applied here. Also, the fact the making something separable that was formally integral is notorious well known in the art and provides no novelty to the claimed invention.